



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/660,613	09/13/2000	Edward W. Laves	29689/36514	7633

7590

05/07/2004

Mr James F Goedken
Marshall O'Toole Gerstein Murray & Borun
6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606-6402

EXAMINER

DUONG, THOMAS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/660,613

Applicant(s)

LAVES, EDWARD W.

Examiner

Thomas Duong

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on February 20, 2004 (Paper No. 5). The amendment filed on February 20, 2004 has been entered and made of record.

Response to Argument

2. Applicant's arguments, see pg.8, lines 9-11, filed January 23, 2004, with respect to *claims 1-22* have been fully considered and are persuasive. The previous rejection has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ulrich et al. (US006052735A) and in view of Schneider et al. (US006016553A).
5. With regard to claims 1, 16-20 and 21, Ulrich reference discloses,
 - *retrieving a first time stamp generated when the first PIM data was entered;*
(Ulrich, col1.8, lines 50-55)

- *retrieving a second time stamp generated when the second PIM data was entered; (Ulrich, col.18, lines 56-61)*
- *comparing the first field identifier and the second field identifier; (Ulrich, col.8, lines 37-44)*
- *comparing the first time stamp and the second time stamp; (Ulrich, col.9 line 67 – col.10, lines 4)*
- *displaying the primacy data field on the display of the PDA; and (Ulrich, col.12, lines 45-55)*
- *displaying a symbol on the display of the PDA to indicate that the subordinate data field is available (Ulrich, col.12, lines 45-55)*

However, Ulrich reference does not explicitly disclose,

- *selecting the first PIM data as a primary data field and the second PIM data as a subordinate data field if the first field identifier matches the second field identifier and the first time stamp is later then the second time stamp;*

Schneider teaches,

- *selecting the first PIM data as a primary data field and the second PIM data as a subordinate data field if the first field identifier matches the second field identifier and the first time stamp is later then the second time stamp; (Schneider, col.6, lines 38-40; col.20, lines 30-35, lines 52-65; col.21, lines 31-34; Schneider teaches that old versions can be stored in an alternate location so that retrieval of the original data is possible)*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Schneider reference with Ulrich reference to allow the user to recover the information to the original state if the user so desired.

This is, in effect, a recovery from a backup in case of a malfunction or error in the system.

6. With regard to claims 2 and 22, Ulrich reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed,

See *claim 1 and 21* rejection as detailed above,

Furthermore, Ulrich reference discloses,

- *detecting a user input associated with the symbol; (Ulrich, col.12, lines 45-55)*
 - *removing the primary data field from the display of the PDA in response to the detection of the user input associated with the symbol; and (Ulrich, col.12, lines 45-55)*
 - *displaying the subordinate data field on the display of the PDA in response to the detection of the user input associated with the symbol (Ulrich, col.12, lines 45-55)*
7. With regard to claim 3, Ulrich reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed,
- *further comprising the step swapping the primary data field and the subordinate data field (Ulrich, col.11, lines 47-50)*
8. With regard to claim 4, Ulrich reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed,
- *further comprising the step of notifying a user during a PDA synchronization session that a subordinate data field exists (Ulrich, col.11, lines 59-63)*
9. With regard to claim 5, Ulrich reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed,
- *further comprising the steps of paging through a plurality of subordinate data fields in response to a user command (Ulrich, col.11, lines 45-55)*
10. With regard to claim 6, Ulrich reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed,
- *further comprising the step of reading a changed record flag to determine if the first PIM data changed (Ulrich, col.12, lines 8-15)*

11. Claims 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ulrich et al. (US006052735A), in view of Schneider et al. (US006016553A) and further in view of Flanagan et al. (US006272545B1).

12. With regard to claims 7-9, Ulrich and Schneider references disclose,

See *claim 1* rejection as detailed above.

However, Ulrich and Schneider references do not explicitly disclose,

- *further comprising the step of synchronizing a clock associated with the PDA and a clock associated with the computing device during a PDA synchronization session*
- *further comprising the step of transmitting a synchronization request to a plurality of PDAs listed in a field specific work group, the field specific work group being associated with the first field identifier*

Flanagan teaches,

- *further comprising the step of synchronizing a clock associated with the PDA and a clock associated with the computing device during a PDA synchronization session* (Flanagan, col.4, lines 23-25)
- *further comprising the step of transmitting a synchronization request to a plurality of PDAs listed in a field specific work group, the field specific work group being associated with the first field identifier* (Flanagan, col.3, lines 3-6)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Flanagan reference with Ulrich and Schneider references to improve the interaction between the desktop computers and mobile devices by synchronizing the clock.

13. With regard to claim 10, Ulrich, Schneider and Flanagan references disclose substantially as claimed,

See *claim 8* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Ulrich reference discloses,

- *wherein the step of transmitting a synchronization request to a plurality of PDAs listed in a field specific work group comprises the step of transmitting a synchronization request via an e-mail message, and (Ulrich, col.4, line 66 – col.5, line 14)*
- *the method further comprises the step of receiving a synchronization initiation message via a TCP/IP protocol from one of the plurality of PDAs listed in the field specific work group (Ulrich, col.4, line 66 – col.5, line 14)*

14. With regard to claim 11-15, Ulrich, Schneider and Flanagan references disclose substantially as claimed,

See *claim 1* rejection as detailed above.

Furthermore, Ulrich reference discloses,

- *further comprising the step of archiving data including the primary data field and the subordinate data field at a host during a PDA synchronization session (Ulrich, col.11, lines 47-50).*
- *wherein the host comprises the computing device (Ulrich, col.11, lines 47-50).*
- *further comprising the steps of browsing the archived data using the PDA and retrieving selected archived data for storage in the PDA (Ulrich, col.12, lines 32-38).*
- *further comprising the step of automatically deleting a portion of the archived data after an aging period (Ulrich, col.10, lines 32-43).*

- *wherein the aging period comprises a user settable aging period (Ulrich, col.10, lines 32-43).*

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicants' disclosure:

- Schneider et al. (US006016553A)
- Mahajan et al. (US006226650B1)

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Thomas Duong whose telephone number is 703/305-1886. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703/308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703/872-9306 for regular communications and 703/872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703/305-3900.

Thomas Duong (AU2143)

April 29, 2004


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100